

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-85 and 105-107 are pending. Claims 86-104 are subject to a restriction requirement and are withdrawn from consideration.

The Applicants thank Examiner Andrew Lee and Primary Examiner Min Jung for the courtesies they extended during the in-person interview of August 20<sup>th</sup> with applicant Thomas Joseph and Applicants' representatives John Harrop and Sean S. Wooden.

Claims 1, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 27-29, 32, 33, 38, 47, 54-58, 60-62, 66-68, 70, 74, 75 and 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Houde and claims 2-11, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 34-37, 39-46, 48-53, 59, 63-65, 69, 71-73, 76-85, 105, and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Houde combined with other references. As discussed during the personal interview, the Applicants explained that Houde does not disclose:

a processor system ... wherein the processor system *controls operation* of the first and the second interfaces and *generates control messages* for sending by the first and the second interfaces

or

wherein a processor in a switching center ... generates the first and second control messages

as recited in independent claims 1, 27, 47 and 105-107 (Emphasis added).

As stated in the Interview Summary, the Examiners "agreed that Claims 1, 27, 46, 47, and 105-107 are not anticipated by the 5,920,822 reference [Houde]." For the same reasons as above, these claims are not rendered obvious in light of Houde. Consequently, since independent claims 1, 27, 46, 47 and 105-107 are allowable over Houde, dependent claims 2-26, 28-45, and 48-85 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-85 and 105-107 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicants and the Examiners also discussed a proposed 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 declaration. The proposed declaration showed that the claimed invention was not obvious in light of the art of record because the claimed invention satisfied a long-felt need and because the Applicants had achieved commercial success due to the switching center with the feature of a single platform or housing with a communications back plane. The Examiners agreed to review the proposed declaration. Examiner Lee communicated that the declaration would be acceptable to show non-obviousness if the Applicants included additional evidence regarding the commercial success.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit the attached Declaration Under Rule 132 with additional evidence regarding the commercial success to show that the pending claims are not rendered obvious. Specifically, by arranging first and second interfaces and a processor in a single platform having a back plane for communication or enclosing a central processor and wireless interface module in a single housing having backplane communications, the Applicants (1) satisfied a long-felt need and (2) achieved commercial success. This novel and non-obvious architectural design has proven to be extremely useful for small-and mid-size wireless networks, and has formed the basis for an extremely profitable business as attested to in the Declarations. As attested to in the attached Declaration, the Applicants have achieved a 800% increase in revenue due to the claimed invention. Therefore, the pending claims are novel and non-obvious.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and the attached declaration, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this response or any other matter, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the Applicants' representative at the below number.

Dated: August 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Sean S. Wooden

Registration No. 43,997

**DORSEY & WHITNEY L.L.P.**

1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Suite 400 South

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 442-3541

Fax: (202) 442-3199

SW/ev

Enclosure: Declaration of Thomas Joseph Under Rule 132